

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the Claims as follows. Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,377,664 (Gerszberg) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,449,498 (Kirbas). Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0014459 (Shanahan). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg in view of Kirbas.

As an initial matter, regarding the Examiner's request for clarification in the Response to Arguments section at page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner is respectfully directed to the paragraph beginning at line 7 of page 6 (of the specification as originally filed), which discloses operations performed every time incoming calls are received.

Claim 5 has been amended to correct a minor typographical.

Gerszberg discloses a video enabled answering machine including customized video announcement messages, caller ID based video announcement messages, and time based video announcement messages to greet the caller (i.e., the calling party as opposed to the called party which receives the call). Thus, Gerszberg discloses an answering machine that allows the use of different greetings for the caller. As such, Gerszberg merely sends a message from a called party's phone to a calling party's phone which is similar to a conventional answering machine sending a voice greeting to calling party's phone.

Kirbas discloses a method and a system for displaying a banner (e.g., an idle mode screen display) comprising a simple image, in a communication device. Kirbas also teaches if today is a predetermined date, the selected banner is displayed. The banner is not operated upon when receiving a phone call.

Shanahan discloses playing a signature file when a phone rings.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1, the Examiner states that the combination of Gerszberg and Kirbas teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1. After reviewing Gerszberg, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. The present application, as defined by Claim 1, is drawn to an apparatus which alerts the user of the telephone of an occasion date when a call is received and displays an image on the called party's phone for viewing (i.e., the same phone). As such, the user of the phone is a called party and the operations are performed on the same phone. In contrast, Gerszberg teaches using caller ID (of an incoming party such as the caller's wife) to send a video greeting to that person (i.e., the calling party). This is more clearly illustrated with reference to FIG. 5 and the paragraphs respectively beginning at lines 5 and 49 of Column 8 of Gerszberg, which teach the video phone users may record video greetings for their answering machines to send a video greeting (300) to a video enabled caller and further teaches the announcement message (300) may appear on the video phone of the calling party. Thus, Gerszberg teaches sending a video greeting from a called party to a calling party. However, Gerszberg does not teach or suggest a method of alerting a

user of an occasion date when a call is received in a phone having an idle mode screen displaying function as recited in Claim 1. As Kirbas does not cure this deficiency, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection under §103(a) of independent Claim 3, the Examiner states that Shanahan does not disclose changing the first predetermined ring sound to a second predetermined ring sound. However, the Examiner states that this step would be obvious. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. As stated in the previous Response dated December 7, 2005, Shanahan teaches playing certain signature files when a phone rings; however, Shanahan does not teach or suggest changing the first predetermined ring sound to a second predetermined ring sound, if today is the registered occasion date to remind the user of the registered occasion date, as recited in Claim 3. Accordingly, as Shanahan does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent Claim 3, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 3 be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection under §103(a) of independent Claim 5, the Examiner states that the combination of Gerszberg and Kirbas teaches each and every limitation of Claim 5. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. First, Claim 5, includes similar recitations as contained in Claim 1 above and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1. Secondly, the Examiner states that Gerszberg teaches playing a first predetermined ring sound as an incoming ring sound, if today is not the registered occasion date and playing a second predetermined ring sound as the incoming

call ring sound, if today is the registered occasion date to remind the user of the registered occasion date, as recited in Claim 1. As discussed above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1, Gerszberg is directed to sending a greeting to a calling party which is similar to a conventional answering machine sending a voice message to a calling party. Thus, Gerszberg does not teach or suggest playing a first predetermined ring sound as an incoming ring sound, if today is not the registered occasion date and playing a second predetermined ring sound as the incoming call ring sound, if today is the registered occasion date to remind the user of the registered occasion date, as recited in Claim 5. Accordingly, as this deficiency is not cured by Kirbas, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 5 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 1, 3, and 5 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2, 4, and 6, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2, 4, and 6 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-6, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the

Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516
PJF/VAG/ml